DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 622 UD 019 883

AUTHOR	Boucouvalas, Marcie
TITLE	Interface: Lifelong Learning and Community Education: Toward a Research Agenda. Research in Community Education, Research Report 79-104.
INSTITUTION	Virginia Univ., Charlottesville. Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, Mich.
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	82p.: Not available in paper copy due to reproduction quality of original document
AVAILABLE FROM	Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, University of Virginia, School of Education, Ruffner Hall, Charlottesville, VA 22903 ($3.75)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Learning: Community Cooperation: *Community Education: Community Involvement: *Continuous Learning: Experiential Learning: Individual Development: Postsecondary Education

ABSTRACT

Lifelong learning and community education are described in this report as concepts reflective of two rapidly evolving worldwide movements. Although the community is advocated as an important element in lifelong learning, and lifelong learning is seen as an integral part of community education endeavors, it is said that proponents of each movement have not had sufficient exposure to the research of the other group. Accordingly, this paper undertakes the following: (1) to briefly cover the essentials of each concept; (2) to examine common misconceptions; (3) to identify and describe some similarities and differences between the two concepts and movements; (4) to pose a number of questions which should serve to focus attention on critical areas; and (5) to present a proposed foundation for building a research agenda based on the essential features of both concepts. (Author/RLV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179622

Interface:

Lifelong Learning and Community Education

Research Report 79-104

Research in Community Education

Marcie Boucouvalas

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Larry E. Decker
Mid-Atlantic Cntr. for Community Ed.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD019883

INTERFACE: LIFELONG LEARNING AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION

TOWARD A RESEARCH AGENDA

Marcie Boucouvalas

Research Report 79-104

This research was supported by C.S. Mott Foundation Grant No. 78-084 to the Mid-Atlantic Community Education Consortium (M. H. Kaplan, Principal Investigator, Research and Evaluation Component).

Developed at the

Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education
School of Education
University of Virginia

1979

MID-ATLANTIC CONSORTIUM
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION BOARD

1978-79

June Bland, Assistant for Evaluation
Division of Research and Evaluation
Washington DC Public Schools

Gerald Bolick, Coordinator
Grants Planning Office
Appalachian State University

Michael Caldwell, Director
Bureau of Educational Research
School of Education
University of Virginia

Bill Grant, Chief
Program Assessment
Division of Instruction
Maryland State Department of Education

Michael Kaplan, Associate Director
Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education
University of Virginia

Robert Lewis, Director
Institutional Studies and Planning Coordinator
Norfolk State College

Jon Magoon, Associate Professor
Department of Education Foundations
University of Delaware

Terry Peterson, Research Coordinator
South Carolina Education Assoc.

Jim Ranson, Associate Dean of Education
West Virginia College of Graduate Studies

Dale Robinson
Director of Planning
Virginia Department of Education

Clark Trivett
Education Research Consultant
Assessment and Evaluation Team
NC Department of Public Instruction

Ken Underwood
Director of Field Services
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Peter Verhoven, Associate Professor
Department of Recreation
Cole Field House
University of Maryland

Marilyn Williams
Federal Grants Coordinator
The Yadkin County Board of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1 THE LIFELONG LEARNING MOVEMENT	4
Lifelong Learning: Philosophy and Concept	4
Genesis	4
Research	4
Social Conditions	5
A Philosophy	5
Ultimate Goal: A Learning Society	6
Lifelong Education: The Organizing Principle	7
Lifelong Education: The Concept	8
Nucleus: Three Dimensions	8
Vertical	8
Horizontal	12
Depth	13
Rounding Out the Concept	13
Development of Lifelong Learners	15
Basic Competencies	15
Toward Operationalization	16
Lifelong Learning/Lifelong Education - The Operational Aspect	17
Lifelong Learning/Lifelong Education - Some Common Misconceptions	23
Summary	24
CHAPTER 2 THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION MOVEMENT	28
Community Education: Philosophy and Concept	28
A Sense of Community	28
Philosophical Bases	
Genesis of the Concept: Practice to Theory	30
Social Conditions: A Catalyst	32
An Evolving Concept: Key Elements, Programs, and Process	32
Programs	33
Process	33

Page

Ultimate Goal: An Educative Community..... 35
Rounding Out the Concept: Key Components... 35
Enrichment of the K-12 Curriculum..... 35
Programs and Services for All Age Groups. 36
Coordination, Cooperation, and Collaboration with all Community Agencies. 36
Maximum Utilization of all Resources..... 36
Community Involvement..... 38

Community Education - The Operational Aspect..... 38
Delivery System or Coordinating Mechanism.... 39
Individual Responsible For Actualizing Community Education Beliefs..... 41
Strategy or Process for Citizen Input.....

Community Education - Some Common Misconceptions.. 42

Summary 44

CHAPTER 3 LIFELONG LEARNING AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION: AN INTERFACE..... 47

Part of a Larger Thrust..... 47
Similarities/Differences and Challenge Questions.. 49
More Global Challenge Questions..... 55
Summary..... 57

CHAPTER 4 TOWARD A RESEARCH AGENDA 61

Previous Efforts to Interface the Two Concepts.... 61
Proposed Framework for Organizing Research.....
Conclusion..... 68

REFERENCES..... 70

PREFACE

This document is part of a series of research and technical reports that were prepared during 1978-79 in conjunction with an action plan for community education research. Research and evaluation are components of the Mid-Atlantic Community Education Consortium's overall effort in community education development.

There is a growing recognition of the importance of research and evaluation among the ranks of community education practitioners as well as college and university faculty. Some researchers are moving toward studies that attempt to answer the difficult aspects of community education. Of special interest to the Mid-Atlantic Research Board was the topic of lifelong learning. The Board was especially interested in examining relationships between the concepts of lifelong learning and community education. In addition, it was suggested that a research agenda be developed.

Most community education research to date has been quantitative; it has also been doctoral dissertation in format. Agendas for research can guide a variety of investigations, using different methodologies. The agenda serves as a springboard; it raises key questions and suggests avenues to explore.

The results of research studies are often unexplained. The researcher doesn't ordinarily communicate with field practitioners, and sometimes not even with fellow researchers, except through journal articles or papers presented at meetings or conferences.

An active program of research and evaluation is essential if community educators are serious about sustaining and expanding developmental efforts, nationally. Legislators and policy makers are becoming less interested in numbers counting and more interested in getting at qualitative factors. A systematic, national research undertaking can be one useful strategy for gaining supporters and advocates of community education. In addition, research results can be used far more successfully in planning in-service and on-going training activities for professionals and community members.

The research agenda in this report serves as a challenge to professionals in lifelong learning and community education. Findings from a variety of studies should be useful to both the theoretician and the practitioner.

M.H. Kaplan
Charlottesville, Virginia
June 1979

INTRODUCTION

Lifelong learning and community education are concepts reflective of two rapidly evolving worldwide movements. Proponents and supporters of each movement, particularly over the last decade, have been busy -- admirably and fervently advancing their causes. As is often the case when trying to make an impact, strides of colleagues involved in complementary endeavors are often not completely understood or sometimes go unnoticed. Such seems to be the case with community education and lifelong learning.

Ironically, the community is advocated as an important element in operationalizing the lifelong learning thrust. Likewise, lifelong learning is heralded as an integral part of community education endeavors. In this respect, both movements working together should produce a far greater impact then either working alone.

The Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, cognizant of this potential synergistic overlap, has taken an incipient step in this direction by comissioning the present paper. Overall, the undertaking may be seen as an initial attempt to lay a foundation for structuring research inquiry relevant to such an interface. Although primarily geared to those individuals maintaining a community education type perspective, the inquiry is also intended for a host

of other scholars and practitioners, from a variety of disciplines and professions who may be interested in lifelong learning within a community context.

The undertaking has a multifold purpose:

1. To briefly, yet comprehensively cover the essentials of each concept (lifelong learning and community education) from both a conceptual and operational perspective.

2. To examine the common misconceptions of each which tend to inhibit further progress.

3. To identify and describe some similarities and differences between the two concepts and movements, which will hopefully stimulate further inquiry in this area.

4. Based on the similarities and differences generated, to pose a number of "challenge questions" which should serve to focus attention on a number of critical issue areas and also to stimulate dialogue.

5. To present a proposed foundation for building a research agenda based on the essential features of both concepts.

This final goal is designed to be a first step in the development of a sound research agenda which might serve to enable both movements to interpenetrate and enrich each other. Development of a more definitive agenda, of course, may be accomplished after a careful analysis of the current state of affairs and a concomitant derivation of problem statements which, in turn, will guide research inquiry.

No effort will be made herein to prioritize the potential research areas of concern, although that is an

essential future step. It is incumbant upon future researchers as well as those in the field, hopefully acting in a mutual endeavor, to decide which issues might take precedence and receive immediate attention. Such decisions may be based upon urgency, degree of payoff, and a host of other factors.

Accordingly, Chapters 1 and 2 will provide a foundation by affording an overview of lifelong learning and community education, respectively, as well as the common misconceptions which hamper the progress of each. Chapter 3, as the title implies, initiates an interface between the two by first of all presenting them as part of a more global thrust in society-at-large, followed by an examination of pertinent similarities and differences, and concluding with a number of "challenge questions" designed to stimulate thought and dialogue. In addition, summaries are provided at the end of each of the first three chapters. Finally, Chapter 4 offers a proposed foundation for building a research agenda which is based on the essential features of both concepts.

In general, the manuscript is meant to stimulate and encourage thought and criticism, as well as dialogue. Feedback is encouraged.

CHAPTER 1

THE LIFELONG LEARNING MOVEMENT

Lifelong Learning: Philosophy and Concept

Genesis

The notion of learning as a lifelong process dates to antiquity as one will discover by traveling back in time to ancient Greece, or to the scripts of China and India or to the many philosophers we might greet on our historic journey. Historians generally recognize, however, that previous ideals and efforts were usually restricted to the elite of society.

What is new, therefore, about present day endeavors is the idea of lifelong learning for all, a condition which has never before existed in history. The intensity and popularity of the current movement toward lifelong learning is emerging with time-appropriateness in response to two equally powerful contributing forces: (a) Research Findings (b) Social Conditions.

Research. Research is currently discrediting many previously held assumptions about learning. For instance, notions such as the following are being discarded:

(a) childhood and youth are the best time for learning, with the corollary belief that adulthood is the time for working not learning; (b) children must be taught that which they will need to know when adult, and the corollary belief that one can learn enough in sixteen to eighteen years to last a lifetime; and (c) school teaching and learning take primacy in the educational process.

Social Conditions. Social conditions give rise to social movements. Accordingly, a number of pressing social forces have given rise to the necessity for and acceptance of lifelong learning on a worldwide basis. Specifically, the following conditions find us in the midst of a rapidly changing society: (a) Boundless proliferation of knowledge (b) Growth of nonwork or leisure time (c) High life expectancy (d) Breakdown in traditions (e) Mobile society. Learning to adapt to and grow from change, as a result, becomes a critical concern.

A philosophy

Lifelong learning is, therefore, first of all a philosophy which espouses the belief that preparation of an individual for continuous inquiry is an essential condition of living; not only to enrich personal development but also for the benefit, survival, and growth of society. The undergirding philosophy of lifelong learning, as a result, is sociopsychological in nature, aimed at improving the quality of life on both an individual and collective basis.

Ultimate goal: a learning society

This philosophy is fundamental to the lifelong learning movement, the central concern of which is learning, not teaching - not education - not schooling in its formal institutional sense. In fact, the ultimate goal of lifelong learning endeavors is the development of a learning society; that is, a vision of society in which education is interwoven with the social, political, and economic fabric such that education is not a system in itself; rather a responsibility of the entire society. Within such a context all agencies and groups share the educational venture, creating an environment in which every individual can and is encouraged to learn. As a subsystem of the larger society, the role of the community is stressed as a crucial element in the lifelong learning movement. The term community in this regard is used in its most comprehensive sense to include all social structures and forces (e.g. neighborhood, family, peer, political, professional, and civic groups; industries, business, government; cultural, religious, recreational, occupational, and health and welfare agencies; as well as mass media of communication and others (Dave, 1973).

Ultimate realization of the learning society is incumbant upon two inextricably intertwined phenomena:

1. Availability of learning opportunities by a spectrum of learning agents (not just the formal educational

system of schools, colleges, etc.) in a variety of formats, in all spheres (physical, emotional, intellectual, spiritual), and for all ages.

2. Preparedness of the learner for lifelong inquiry - that is, self-directed, self-managing learners prepared to share their learning with others.

Movement toward a learning society, as a result signifies reorganization and redefinition not only of the educational system, but of society itself, thus providing a new arrangement between society and education.

Lifelong Education: The organizing principle

In order to guide development throughout life and foster the nurturance of a learning society, lifelong education has emerged as the organizing principle. In fact, UNESCO, a prime catalyst in the lifelong learning movement, has proposed and promoted lifelong education as a "master concept" to guide reconstruction of the entire educational system in both developed and developing countries (Faure, 1972).

Movement is encouraged, as a result, from the present system of "terminal education" to lifelong education "not (as) an educational system, but (as) the principle upon which the overall organization of a system is founded" (Faure, 1972, p. 182). "Terminal education", as the word implies, refers to a view which regards education as something one has or possesses, like a degree, a credential,

etc. Such views are reflective in expressions such as "terminal degree", "finish your education", and one could probably add others.

Under a lifelong learning/lifelong education thrust learning, not teaching becomes a central feature. With such an emphasis on learning, both the process and product of education are transformed, as depicted in Table 1, page 9.

Understanding the philosophical groundwork of the movement and its challenge to the present educational system is an important start, but alone does not afford a thorough understanding of the basic dimensions of the concept, an issue addressed in the following section. Since lifelong education has been proposed as the organizing principle to guide us toward a learning society most conceptualizations focus around this term.

Lifelong Education: The Concept

Nucleus: Three Dimensions

Lifelong education is conceptually articulated along three (3) dimensions: Vertical, Horizontal, and Depth.

Vertical. The vertical dimension, implicit in the term lifelong, formally recognizes learning as a lifelong process, and challenges society to provide educative environments for people at any age or stage of development. The present educational system is likewise challenged to redefine, reorient, and reintegrate the role of education in society.

TABLE 1

Comparative List of Characteristics of Education Under Present "Terminal System" versus under Lifelong Education [a]

Present System "Terminal Education"	System Based on Principle of Lifelong Education
Concentrates primarily on one period of life known as youth	Covers the entire life-span
Concentrates on transmission of knowledge with primary emphasis on intellectual development	Fosters development of inquiry skills and self-direction with emphasis on the total person in intellectual, emotional, social, and spiritual areas and integration among them. Also recognizes a continuum of learning needs from basic survival to more transpersonal.
Definition and source of knowledge narrow in scope; logic emphasized	Recognizes and is based on a view of many sources of knowledge, including the intuitive mode
Based on premise that education is a means by which cultural heritage is handed down	Based on expanded premise that education is a means of development
Emphasizes possession (degree, certificate, credential)	Empahsizes being-stress both individual and societal self-renewal
Segments learning into subject-centered approach	Attempts to make learning more life-centered and problem-centered and emphasizes integration among subject areas
Serves as a means of directing individuals into career choices both by educational institution and employers and, as a result, enhances only a selected segment of an individual's skills	Frowns upon developing only a specific component of individual's ability and seeks to draw out and develop individual's entire potential as a full being
Embraces linear life pattern model of school (in youth) work (in adulthood) leisure (in old age)	Extends education to cover all of life's roles and goals and seeks integration among learning, work, and leisure
Views Education as provided by only one section of society - educational institutions	Views Education as provided by whole of society in different contexts and at different times

[a]Based on information presented at the UNESCO Interdisciplinary Symposium on Lifelong Education, Paris, September 25 - October 2, 1972.

Reflecting the developmental stages of life and the unique needs each stage represents, it becomes apparent that education does not end upon the completion of formal schooling since, as recognized, what one learns in school is insufficient to sustain one throughout life. The cruciality of developing "inquiry skills" in younger years is stressed as an indispensable feature of the lifelong learning movement, particularly since such skills would enable one to engage in learning as a continuous lifelong pursuit.

UNESCO has directed a sizable effort to the revision of school curricula and evaluation, as well as teacher training in the light of lifelong education (Cropley and Dave, 1978; Dave 1973; Dave, 1974; Dave and Stiemerling, 1973; Lynch, 1977; Skager and Dave, 1977; Skager, 1978). This has been overshadowed, however, particularly in the United States, with the concerted efforts directed at the adult component of lifelong learning endeavors. This situation is reflective in a number of publications (for example, Lifelong Learning by Roger Hiemstra; Lifelong Learning in the Nation's Third Century by James R. Broschart; The Lifelong Learner by Ron Gross, and others); in projects, such as the College Board's Future Directions for a Learning Society, and Harvard University's Institute for the Management of Lifelong Education (both discussed in the section on operationalization of the concept); as well as in recently passed public policy

(P.L. 94-482, Title 1, Part 13, Sections 131-134, Higher Education) of the Educational Amendments of 1976.

While the individuals involved in the above undertakings generally recognize that the adult years are only one component of the lifelong learning thrust, readers and consumers sometimes do not, thus perpetuating a semantic dilemma which often translates into operational narrowness, a feature further discussed under the section on operationalization.

It may help, however, to understand that the adult component has been emphasized for a number of reasons:

1. Adults - from parents to policymakers to practitioners - will be responsible for implementing conceptual ideals.

2. Adults, with the exception of remedial focuses, have been a neglected aspect of previous policies and practices.

3. Adults occupy the largest segment of the population and, as a result, efforts focused in their direction represent a national capital investment.

Therefore, although lifelong education is NOT synonymous with adult education, stress must be given to the responsibility of adults to operationalize the concept; to act as role models for youth, as well as to support appropriate policies and practices in order that we might effectively address all stages of development and change in the life-span of all individuals.

Horizontal. The horizontal dimension addresses three factors: (a) Many agents of learning co-exist within a community, including formal, nonformal, and informal educational systems (b) Learning penetrates into every aspect of life including the intellectual, physical, emotional, social, and spiritual (c) Learning may be planned as well as incidental. As such the lifelong learning movement and the lifelong education concept cut across the spectrum of learning agents, spheres, and formats.

The formal educational system of schools, colleges, etc. is seen as only one component on a continuum of learning agents, which includes nonformal forces of work places, libraries, museums, religious institutions, mass media, etc. as well as informal sources such as family, friends, peers, subject matter professionals, etc. Institutions, associations, organizations, groups, and individuals all become potential resources as facilitators of learning. Furthermore, integration, collaboration and change among the different agents is stressed. Particularly pertinent is the notion that out-of-school learning is recognized as an integral part of endeavors.

In this regard Spaulding (1974) offers a typology of services and institutions which contribute to the conceptualization of a delivery system for lifelong education. His model illustrates the diversity of educational agents manifest in a framework as broad as lifelong learning. The typology, based on the way in which clientele participate,

ranges from highly structured organizations with fairly prescriptive content to services which provide a range of activities from which an individual may freely select. The main drawback to the model is Spaulding's omission of family, friends, colleagues and other non-organized collectives which are important informal agents. Accordingly, the essentials of Spaulding's six-pronged typology are presented in Figure 1, page 14, with a seventh category added by the writer. Implicit in such a conceptualization is the notion that all spheres of learning are included and that a variety of learning formats and styles are represented.

Depth Dimension. Less well conceptualized than vertical and horizontal, the depth dimension, set forth by Kidd (1973, 1975) serves an integrative function, recognizing a continuum of needs ranging from simple survival to more transpersonal domains. Rendering a qualitative aspect to the concept, the depth dimension suggests that the quality of life - the overarching goal of the lifelong learning movement, may be defined, interpreted and applied differently depending upon one's locale on the depth continuum. Since this dimension, however, is still in embryonic stages of conceptualization, a more in-depth discussion at this point would be both premature and counterproductive.

Rounding Out the Concept

The three basic dimensions: vertical, horizontal, and depth form the nucleus of the lifelong learning/lifelong education concept. Mere provision or availability of learning

Nature of Learning Agent	FORMAL [a]		NONFORMAL				INFORMAL
TYPE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
DESCRIPTION	Highly structured and prescriptive	Highly structured and prescriptive, but with some flexibility	Moderately structured leading to prescriptive goals; usually seminars and courses	Loosely structured services; prescriptive message and content	Participant Governed Groups & Clubs Exists because of membership; responsive to their needs & interests	Educational & Informational Media & Services Individuals select according to need and interest	Individual Resources for learning, which individuals or groups may tap into for their expertise, knowledge, skill, guidance, etc.
	Usually linked to degree, diploma, credential, etc.		Sometimes leading to credential or certificate, but not always	Rarely leading to credential	Little or no credentialing offered in itself participation itself usually a motivator		
EXAMPLES	Traditional schools, colleges & universities	Innovative schools, universities	Some community school courses; University without walls; armed forces training; some training in business & industry	Some community school courses; Cooperative Extention; some Staff development in business & industry; health education; consummer education, professional associations, etc.	Social service clubs (e.g. Lions, ethnic, senior citizens) political organizations; religious groups; youth groups (e.g. Girls Scouts) community groups & councils	Mass media (TV, Radio newspaper, book publishing,) libraries, films, museums, book stores, etc.	Family, friends, peers, colleagues, professionals in the community, etc.

CLOSED (Completely prescriptive standards set by authority; recognized certificate of attainment.) ——— OPEN (Non prescriptive, non competitive goals and content set of participants)

[a] Although many techniques used in the formal system may be "open" and "informal", the general goal of the learning endeavor is the formal purpose of education which is usually geared toward a degree or certificate.

Figure 1. Typology of Lifelong Learning Educational Services and Activities.. Adapted from: Spaulding, Seth, Lifelong education. A modest model for planning and research, Comparative Education, 10(2), 1974, pp. 101-113.

opportunities, however, by a gamut of agents, in a totality of learning spheres, and in diverse formats is a necessary but insufficient condition to ensure actualization of a learning society, an ultimate goal of the movement.

Development of Lifelong Learners. The parallel development of a lifelong learner is a critical prerequisite lest we fall prey to the pitfalls of winding up merely with a training and/or credentialized society, a concern voiced by both Ohliger (1974, 1975) and Ziegler (1977). Learners who can plan and evaluate their own learning experiences, learners who will initiate learning activities other than those sponsored, learners who will assume responsibility for sharing their learnings with others - these are the true hallmarks of the lifelong learner.

Basic Competencies. Development of skills, therefore, which would enable one to pursue learning as a lifelong pursuit are cognitive, and notivational, as well as attitudinal.

On the cognitive level the fundamental tools of learning include both the basic survival/learning skills of reading, writing, speaking, and computing, as well as the more abstract intellectual competencies of critical thinking, conceptualizing, analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating, which in turn may be applied to more basic competencies of problem-solving and decision-making. Alone, however, these skills will not produce a lifelong learner, but only one who is prepared to learn (or prepared to be taught), sometimes by external or instrumental motivation.

A lifelong learner is ultimately motivated by an innate desire to learn and envisions learning as an end in itself, or at least as a pathway to higher quality of life. Essentailly, a lifelong learner is a self-directed learner who has assumed responsibility for satisfying internal drives, managing one's own learning experience, and seeking quidance where needed. Self-directed learners in externally imposed learning situations are able to extract whatever resources are peculiar to their own needs and, in general, maintain an open frame of mind (Knowles, 1975).

Lifelong learners, in addition to assuming responsiblity for directing their own learning, have also assumed responsibility for sharing this learning with others so that the "process of collective and continuous growth" is enhanced. This concept, which Dave (1975) refers to as "inter-learning," essentially implies the development of an attitude of sharing and mutual exploration--a cooperative as opposed to competitive outlook.

Toward Operationalization

All this is a heavy bill to fill, one which demands drastic reorganization of the present educational system. Lifelong learning as a movement and lifelong education as an organizing principle have profound implications for educational administration (planning, finance, organization, structure), educational technology (curriculum, learning formats, evaluations) as well as for the whole learning-teaching process.

This feat, of course, will not occur overnight; however, some initial steps are in progress. Others must be catalyzed. The next section, as a result, will focus on the operationalization of this concept as it is emerging in the United States.

Lifelong Learning/Lifelong Education - The Operational Aspect

A concept as broad and comprehensive as lifelong learning needs a well thought out and effectively implemented strategy for operationalization. How such an ideology will be financed, administered, organized, etc. are all questions of critical importance.

Although still struggling to find its way as a wholistic operational reality in the United States, elements of the concept abound. From graduate students (Knowles, 1975) to elementary schoolers (Jackson, 1974) efforts are being made to foster self-directedness.

In the formal educational sector returning students, nontraditional students, displaced homemakers, incarcerated inmates on educational furlough, off-campus programs, etc. are all receiving increasing attention. In the nonformal educational sector learning agents such as work places are expanding human resource development (HRD) efforts to include personal as well as professional development; libraries are more and more recognizing their roles as facilitators of lifelong self-directed learners; museums are paying increasing

attention to their roles as learning agents and, in fact, are hiring individuals with professional expertise in "learning" to develop and organize such efforts. Likewise, the mass media are becoming sensitized to the movement, not only in their role of marketing and promoting the concept, but also in the form of TV programs and advertisements which are beginning to reflect the growing phenomenon.

Finally, in the informal sector travel agents are promoting vacations which also entail a "learning experience", doctors and dentists are providing literature on health education, as well as audio-visual attempts in this area, and the list could go on and on. These examples only highlight some of the significant signposts as lifelong learning begins to take root. Perhaps the most meaningful thrusts, however, are organized, collective actions at the national level in the form of policy, projects, etc. which might serve to guide our future course as a nation.

Policy

Although not funded, policy has been enacted at the federal level and attention is increasingly being directed to the development of guidelines for state policy. In fact, a National Invitational Conference was held recently in Orlando, Florida to facilitate state planning for lifelong learning (State Planning, 1977). On a more specific level, the American Association for Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) has undertaken a three year project (1979-81) to

develop a policy framework around the principle of lifelong education. Action on the local level is harder to keep up with, although the local community is apparently emphasized as the key to operationalizing the concept.

Projects

In addition to policy which will, indeed, guide our actions, many other issues beckon. The whole notion of making that ultimate transition from the present "traditional system" to a system based on the principle and premises of lifelong education is of vital concern. The American higher education system seem to be the target for initial efforts in this direction. Harvard University's Institute for the Management of Lifelong Education is dedicated to this concern. In fact, the stated purpose of their first Institute/ Workshop (August 5-15, 1979), is to "assist the leadership of American higher education to charter new institutional directions, to define new roles, and to implement lifelong education in responsible, effective ways" (The National Institute, 1979, p. 3).

Finally, the staff of the College Board's Future Directions for a Learning Society (FDLS), funded by Exxon, are gearing their efforts toward the ultimate goal of the lifelong learning movement; that is, the development of a learning society. With a visionary yet "here and now" orientation, the project has a four-fold purpose: (Future Directions for a Learning Society, 1978, p. 12).

1. Make projections of future societal trends and needs that have implications for adult learning.

2. Disseminate information on the needs of adult learners and of agencies, institutions, and others that serve them.

3. Promote improved public policy and public understanding about lifelong learning.

4. Establish services to improve adult access and transitions to learning opportunities.

Although the project targets only the adult learner, the efforts seem just a first step in redressing previous disparities and in ensuring an effectively oriented adult audience and public who might guide reconstruction of youth education, whether in their roles as parents, policymakers, practitioners, or professionals.

Perhaps the most thorough and inclusive treatment to date, however, of current practices and available resources for lifelong learning is that of Peterson (1979) which is essentially a survey of the programs, policies, and practices of lifelong learning in America. The publication itself, slanted to the adult years, seems to reflect the trend in the United States.

Moving from Ideology to Operation

Lifelong learning is essentially clearer as a conceptual movement than as an operational one. A concept as broad and comprehensive as lifelong learning, with such ambitious goals, depends upon input from a variety of forces and sources, as well as from other movements in order to actualize its purpose.

For instance, the entire adult education movement must contribute an important part to lifelong learning endeavors. The human resource development (HRD) movement, concerned with developing human resources in work places would likewise contribute a vital thrust. The human potential movement as well as the humanistic and transpersonal psychology movements with their concerns on developing the whole person will similarly contribute a much needed momentum. In this light, the community education movement may be seen as contributing a most critical input in the movement toward lifelong learning.

This line of thought is not meant to relegate any movement to a subordinate status, but to illustrate the notion that lifelong learning is an ideology whose implementation is incumbant upon an interplay of forces and movements contributing in a synergistic manner their specific area of expertise in developing a lifelong learner and actualizing a learning society.

No one definable or exclusive lifelong educator exists, since it is not an exclusive function. Likewise, a Lifelong Educator's professional association at the national level is nonexistent because a cross-section of professionals who identify with a variety of other professional roles have a complementary part in the lifelong education endeavor. Such an entity is possible, however, and in fact necessary for the fruition of a learning society. Perhaps the most distinct depiction of such efforts is the Minnesota Learning

Society, a consortium of educational organizations and other agencies working together to provide a wide range of opportunities to people, but with the vision of a time when many-- if not all --community resources "everything from department stores to airports will dedicate some part of their energy and resources to the education of the people as a whole" (Mondale, 1976, p. 43).

Thus, although the philosophical and conceptual treatment of lifelong learning is clearly stated, operationalization is proceeding in a piecemeal fashion. Consequently, a number of hurdles must be overcome:

1. A concept as broad as lifelong education, with such ambitious goals, can hardly be left to educators alone. We must get it out of educational circles. An initial impetus has been generated in the theoretical realm by Dave (1976), whose edited work remains as to examines how lifelong education interfaces with seven major disciplines (philosophy; history; sociology; anthropology; ecology; psychology; and economics). Likewise, Cropley (1977) has expanded his treatise on psychology to a book length analysis. A challenge still how we might operationalize this tenet.

2. Some sort of guidance at the national, state and local levels either as a coordinating mechanism or as a stimulant is needed. Efforts such as the Future Directions for a Learning Society and Harvard University's

Institute for the Management of Lifelong Education are providing an important thrust, but are generally geared only to the adult years a situation which leads us to our third hurdle.

3. Common misconceptions and narrow definitions of lifelong education and lifelong learning abound, thus leading to a fragmented operational effort. Such misconceptions are the focal point of the next and final section in our discussion of the lifelong learning movement.

Lifelong Learning - Some Common Misconceptions

Perhaps the most common pitfall in understanding and operationalizing the lifelong learning/lifelong education concept is perceiving only a portion of the concept and mistaking it for the whole. Enumerated below are a number of ways in which this may happen (and is happening). The reader might keep in mind that lifelong learning is not only the name of the movement, but the philosophy upon which the movement is based. Lifelong education is the organizing principle to guide growth and development and to serve as a foundation for reorganizing the present educational system.

1. Lifelong learning is NOT just a psychological concept; it is sociopsychological, concerned with both individual and societal self-renewal and growth.

2. Lifelong education and adult education are NOT synonymous as is commonly misconceived. As promoted by UNESCO,

lifelong education deals with the entire lifespan. A unifying theme for all efforts is the cultivation of self-managing, self-directed learners. Since youth must be guided by adults who hopefully will offer effective role models and support relevant policies and practices, the adult component is stressed.

3. Lifelong education is NOT restricted to course offerings or structured programs as is sometimes seen. Neither is it a program in itself.

4. The school is NOT the only legitimate provider of learning opportunities as is often assumed.

5. A learning society is NOT synonymous with a trained and/or credentialized society.

6. A learning society is NOT the mere provision or availability of learning opportunities as is often misconceived.

Summary

Lifelong learning is basically a sociopsychological concept which philosophically espouses the belief that continuous inquiry is an essential condition of living both for individual and societal self-renewal and growth.

Improving the quality of life, as a result, becomes the overarching goal of the movement whose ultimate purpose is to create a learning society, that is a society in which self-directing lifelong learners have available to them throughout their lives a gamut of learning opportunities

and an educative environment in which all agencies and groups share the educative venture. Democratization of education, consequently, is a basic element in the ideology. Although this is a visionary goal at present, such ideals guide both our thinking and action.

Learning, not teaching, is the central theme of the lifelong learning movement, thus the name lifelong learning, rather than lifelong education movement. Learning, however, is only the change in knowledge, skills, behavior or attitude which results. Education is the process by which learning is directed. In order to actualize this vision, therefore, lifelong education has emerged as a guiding principle and "master concept" in the reorganization of current educational endeavors.

Lifelong education represents a qualitative transformation in the nature and mode of learning and implies, as a result, a total restructuring of the present system to put learning at the heart of all efforts. Mere provision or availibility of learning opportunities, however, is a necessary but insufficient condition for the realization of a learning society. The concomitant development of a lifelong learner is critical. Lifelong learners are essentially self-directed, self-managing learners who have assumed responsibility for diagnosing their own learning needs, planning as well as evaluating learning experiences, seeking resources and

guidance when needed. The lifelong learner, motivated primarily by intrinsic "rewards," has also assumed responsibility for sharing this learning with others, having learned the fine art and science of cooperation and collaboration.

The learner referred to may be a preschooler, a young child, an adolescent, a young adult, an adult at any stage or age or development as well as our older populations. The nourishment of a self-directed learner, as a result, evolves with the growth of the individual toward maturity.

In addition to this vertical dimension of recognizing and reflecting all ages and stages of development, the lifelong education concept (as the guiding principle to lifelong learning) hosts likewise horizontal and depth dimensions. Horizontally the concept encourages the recognition and integration of the many agents of learning (schools, non school organizations, and informal resources such as peers, friends, family, professionals, etc.). Similarly, learning permeates all spheres of life, -- the intellectual, the emotional, physical, social and spiritual, and a concerted integration among them is urged. Finally, the recognition of a gamut of learning formats from structured, planned institutionalized learning to non institutionalized incidental learning rounds out the horizontal dimension.

The depth dimension, although in embryonic stages of conceptualization, seeks integration among the vertical and horizontal components - by recognizing that individuals are at different levels of being and, as a result, are motivated by different learning needs -- from simple needs to the more transpersonal needs. Accordingly our needs among the different spheres (e.g. intellectual, emotional, etc.) may range from simple in one area to more complex in another.

Operationally speaking, implementation of lifelong learning tenets in the United States stresses the adult component. Policy and projects such as the Future Directions for a Learning Society and the Institute for the Management of Lifelong Learning are guiding national efforts in this direction. The adult component, although an essential first step in preparing an effective cadre of parents, policymakers, professionals, practitioners and citizens tends, however, to overshadow the totality of the thrust, thus perpetuating a common misconception that lifelong learning/education is synonymous with adult learning/education. In reality, actualization of the lifelong learning ideology will be dependent upon the synergistic interplay of a number of forces and movements in society.

For example, the entire adult education movement will continue to contribute an important part to lifelong learning endeavors, as will the human resource development (HRD) movement, the humanistic and transpersonal psychology movements, and others. From this perspective, the community education movement, the focal point of the next chapter, becomes a critical nexus in operationalizing the movement toward lifelong learning.

CHAPTER 2

THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION MOVEMENT

Community Education: Philosophy and Concept

A Sense of Community

The search for a sense of "community", a concept which dates to antiquity, is increasingly receiving a renewed thrust in modern times. In fact, it appears that the discovery of "community" may be the "energy-releasing mode of the 80's and 90's." So says psychologist Jack Gibb (1978, p. 284) who, having progressively worked from individuals to groups to communities over the past three or four decades, sees the community as a "powerful instrument of social change" (p. 217).

Likewise, Roger Hiemstra, who has popularized the notion of "educative community" (Hiemstra, 1972) sees the community - not the nation - not the state - as the basic unit for problem-solving and curing societal ills. An "educative community", in effect, is a "living learning laboratory" in which a dynamic linkage between the home, school, and community exists, and fosters both individual and collective development. As a result, by synergistic interaction of the various elements, the potential for

a self-directing community is born. All these notions reflect the basic beliefs upon which the rapidly evolving community education movement is predicated.

The philosophical beliefs underlying the concept are interwoven throughout the literature on community education. Recurring themes espoused by proponents include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Education is a continuous, ongoing lifelong process (Cox, 1975; Decker, 1975; Seay, 1974; Totten, 1977).

2. Education is not synonymous with schooling and should be the responsibility of all community agencies (Boles and Seay, 1974: Decker, 1975: LeTarte and Minzey, 1972; Seay, 1974).

3. Education should be (life-centered) based on problems, needs, and interests of the learner (Decker, 1975; Olson and Clark, 1977; Seay, 1974).

4. Citizens should have input in the decision-making process (Decker, 1975; LeTarte and Minzey, 1972; Martian and Seay, 1974).

5. An interdependent relationship exists between the home, school, and the community (Cox, 1975; Decker, 1975; Seay, 1974; Totten 1977).

6. Education has the responsibility of fostering individual and social change (Boles and Seay, 1974; Decker, 1972; Seay, 1974).

7. Education should foster individuality while at the same time teach an understanding of others (Boles and Seay, 1974: Olson and Clark, 1977, Totten, 1977).

8. Educational activities should be reflective of local needs (Olson and Clark, 1977; Seay, 1974).

9. An understanding of the local community helps the individual to better understand the global community (Decker, 1975; Totten, 1977).

10. Education should meet the needs of all community members (Boles and Seay, 1974; Totten, 1977; Woods and Seay, 1974).

Founded on these beliefs, the present conceptualization of community education has been an evolutionary process.

Genesis of the Concept: Practice to Theory

Current conceptualizations of community education have evolved from an innovative idea in one local community; to a field of practice; to a movement much more comprehensive in scope than original endeavors and replete with a growing conceptual base. The innovative idea was to keep the schools open during evenings and weekends in order to provide recreation activities for youth. Frank Manley, physical education teacher in the Flint, Michigan public schools is credited with this feat, as well as with eliciting financial support of C.S. Mott, a wealthy industrialist.

Events burgeoned quickly thereafter. Rapidly, the schools became a gathering place for all members of the community, and a multitude of educational, recreational, social and health services were offered. This progression, in turn, attracted sizable funds from Mott (through the establishment of a private foundation) to spread the concept nationwide.

As schools across the nation pursued similar efforts, a new movement was born -- the community school movement -- with a cadre of professionals known as community school directors and a professional association, the National Community School Education Association.

The community school movement was initially conceived as a means of deriving maximum utilization of school facilities, while at the same time serving as a resource to the entire community. Over the years the use of citizen input which often took the form of community advisory councils grew in importance to become a central feature of the concept.

Reaching out further into the community, these professionals realized that education does not take place in the school building alone. Thus the community school movement gradually evolved into a community education movement which regards the school as only one of a multitude of educative agents in the community. During the early 70's the professional association officially changed its name to National Community Education Association, recognizing that agencies other than schools may take

the lead for implementing the community education concept.

Social Conditions: A Catalyst

The forces in society-at-large which have propagated the necessity and desire for lifelong learning (boundless proliferation of knowledge, growth of nonwork or leisure time, high life expectancy, breakdown in traditions, mobile society) have likewise provided impetus for the evolution of the community education movement. In addition, a number of forces which are drawing people together in groups at the local level have afforded additional momentum:

- General societal concerns such as unemployment, crime and inflation.
- Increased feelings of alienation as evidenced by voter apathy, political mistrust, urban isolation, and the fact that many public service agencies are serving only a fraction of the eligible clients.
- Environmental concerns such as pollution, energy, and ecology.
- Youth unrest -- with associated problems of juvenile delinquency, violence and vandalism, and drug abuse.

An Evolving Concept: Key Elements, Program and Process

As a concept community education is still evolving (replete with growing pains). Unfortunately, due to its rapid growth, many supporters do not perceive the concept

in its totality, an observation stressed by Decker (1975). Probably the most significant feature and one which is crucial to a comprehensive understanding of the total concept is the assertion by most authors that community education is primarily a process and as such should not be confused with its programs, which are activities related to the solution of particular community needs.

Programs. As a result of involving local citizens of all ages in the identification, planning, implementation, and evaluation of change in a community, the development of programs may emerge as one solution to the issues identified. Any set of activities designed to meet an identified need or problem in conceived as a program. As a result, programs include activities such as field trips for young children, classes or course offerings for adults, meals-on-wheels programs for senior citizens, recreational activities for youth, etc. Process, on the other hand, is a more complex issue.

Process. As a result of a comprehensive multi-disciplinary review of related literature on process, Warden (1979) developed a four- fold typology which he, in turn, applied to an analytic review of community education literature.

Although each of the four categories delineated below reflects a specific perspective as to the role and function of process, one may interpenetrate the other and, as a result, are not meant to be mutually exclusive.

Community Educators tend to use process to mean:

1. Process as Procedure - Primary concern is with enlisting input on the strategy, design, and/or implementation of one previously established goals or objectives. How to identify resources and develop plans of action is stressed.

2. Process as Problem Solving - Stress is placed on engendering individual and collective collaboration in solving existing problems, which are usually specifically identified.

3. Process as Community Power - Issues, from this perspective, serve primarily as a method of involvement and social action. The key is to organize people and, as a result, increase the power of the whole community. This approach is the least frequently used in community education, while the next approach is the most frequently used.

4. Process as Psychological and Social Development - Stressing both individual and group growth, the key concern in this approach is ultimate learning for self-guided action.

Equating process orientation with people orientation, Warden (1979) stresses that the main goal of community education efforts is to encourage participation in learning both on an individual and collective basis as a member of the community; a process, in effect, which "sees the entire community with all its resources and people as an educational and community development enterprise" (p. 59).

Ultimate Goal: An Educative Community

The entire community as an educational enterprise is akin to the notion of "educative community" proposed by Hiemstra (1972). Community educators in general, even those not speaking this language, seem also to aspire to the ideal. Essentially, the ultimate goal of community education is the development of self-guiding, self-directed communities which are able to identify and satisfy the needs of all their community members through the coordination, cooperation, and collaboration of all community resources. Visionary in nature, this ideal, conceptually speaking, seems to be the ultimate goal toward which community education efforts are directed.

Rounding Out the Concept: Key Components

The key elements of programs and process are operationalized in an integrated fashion via a number of key thrusts. Although articulated differently by various authors, the major components upon which all might agree can be summarized as follows: (a) Enrichment of the K-12 curriculum (b) Programs and services for all age groups (c) Coordination, cooperation, and collaboration among all community agencies (d) Maximum utilization of all resources (e) Community involvement.

Enrichment of the K-12 Curriculum. All authors emphasize adaptation of the formal education system (school) to a more life-centered curriculum by enlarging the notion of school to include the entire community. This implies

recognition of nonformal and informal educational opportunities in the learning process.

Programs and Services for All Groups. Stressed by all authors is the notion that each age group (e.g., pre-school, youth, adult, senior citizens, etc.) has specific needs and that the community can and should attend to the entire life cycle. Also targeted are the needs of frequently underserved groups such as the disadvantaged, ethnic minorities, handicapped, women, etc.

Coordination, Cooperation, and Collaboration Among all Community Agencies. In order to ensure coordination, cooperation, and collaboration among all community agencies as a constant ongoing function, most authorities advocate the formation of an interagency council -- that is, a representative group of providers who would have an impact in mobilizing such efforts. Such a group would strive to eliminate existing and potential duplications. An interagency council might also engage in mutual goal setting and planning, all of which might contribute to the advancement of an educative community.

Maximum Utilization of All Resources. The idea of community resources encompasses the financial, human, and material realms. Financial resources include: revenue from tax dollars, funds available in agency budgets, funds generated from money raising programs, grants, and also contributions from individuals and/or foundations.

Human resources include, but are not limited to, agency personnel, members of the professional community, and individual community members such as parents, students, senior citizens who, with their different backgrounds and experiences, provide a wealth of generally untapped human resources. Finally, material resources generally include physical facilities and equipment (both hardware and software).

How these resources are used will differ from community to community, and might include educational and noneducational purposes. For instance, educationally, a community might tap into individual members as rich learning resources -- in addition to soliciting their involvement as facilitators in educational programs.

In the non-educational realm, resources might be shared to increase the efficient use of existing agency sources. For example, to potentially provide a system for transportation of clients to existing services, interagency collaboration (as discussed in point) may lead to a maximum utilization of resources by having one agency provide a vehicle(s) (material), another the driver (human), and a third assume the cost of maintenance and operation of the vehicles (financial).

In conclusion, a noteworthy observation is the strong feeling expressed by most authors that the schools

represent a rich resource whose physical facilities, particularly, should be maximally utilized to serve the community.

Community Involvement. Community involvement is the key to operationalization of the total community education concept. Without community involvement, the process component of community education is incomplete. The reader will recall that the most significant feature of the concept was the assertion by most authors that community education is primarily a process, and as such, should not be confused with its programs.

The presence of local advisory councils, composed of a representative group of citizens, is a frequently used means of assuring community involvement as an ongoing process. The purpose of an advisory council is to identify and prioritize the needs of the community; to identify resources available to meet needs; to develop and implement planning and evaluation of solution-oriented strategies.

An effective advisory council member is not an isolated individual, but represents a stratum of the community with whom he/she theoretically meets prior to converging with the council. In this way, most community members have an opportunity to learn to engage in the advisory process.

Community Education: The Operational Aspect

In order to address the five components of operationalization (enrichment of the K-12 curriculum;

programs and services for all age groups; cooperation, coordination and collaboration among all community agencies; maximum utilization of all resources; and community involvement) communities throughout the country have devised strategies for implementing the community education concept, based on local needs and availability of resources. In all cases, however, three factors are found in successful efforts; each of which is discussed below:

1. A delivery system or coordinating mechanism.
2. Individual responsible for actualizing community education beliefs.
3. Strategy or process for citizen input.

Delivery System or Coordinating Mechanism

Since the early days of the movement, and continuing into the present, the community schools have been the delivery system through which the community education concept is most often implemented. In fact, much justification is centered around the rationale that the public school may even be the best coordinating mechanism. Harding Mott (Subcommittee Report, 1973) cites the following reasons:

Public schools;

1. Are generally, centrally located
2. Can be found in each community throughout the country
3. Have facilities suited for a wide variety of uses

4. Have many resources for identification and resolution of human problems

5. Are publicly owned

6. Are nonpolitical institutions

The rationale is further advanced by authors such as Kaplan (1975), Decker (1976) and others who key on the tremendous tax wastage when school facilities are underutilized. The phenomenon of declining enrollments which are creating surplus facilities seems to lend further substance to the proposition. In fact, public policy in support of community education at Federal, State, and local levels is presently geared to school-based models.

Increasingly recognized, however, is the notion that the needs, resources, and climate of the local community dictate that leadership often be taken by some other agency such as the community college, recreation department, public library, cooperative extension agency, or city-county governing board (Parsons, 1976).

In addition, Weaver (1972) challenges community educators to examine and develop both school and nonschool-based models and suggests that insistence on purely school based models may hamper further progress of the movement.

The coordinating mechanism, whether a community school or another model, must be willing to accept responsiblity for all components of the community education

concept. Although the vehicle may not provide all the services, it must agree to provide the leadership necessary to coordinate, encourage, and sometimes initiate the various aspects. This acceptance of responsibility is, apparently, what differentiates a district with community education from one without (Minzey, 1974).

Individual Responsibile for Actualizing the Community Education Concept

Although the individual may have any number of titles, including community education facilitator, coordinator, director, he/she performs two basic functions:

1. Develops methods for incorporating citizen input into the decision making process.

2. Coordinates allocation of all available resources to meet needs identified by the community, generally accomplished through the development of interagency or resource councils.

Vehicle for Citizen Input

The critical factor in the development of an "educative community" or "sense of community" is clearly the development of a process ensuring citizen input into the decision-making process. The strategies often employed include:

- Advisory Councils
- Volunteer Programs
- Community surveys and needs assessments

- Town Meetings
- Task Forces
- Charettes
- Problem-solving Groups

Thus, with a vehicle for citizen input, an individual responsible for providing direction, and a delivery system; as well as with an evolving conceptual base, community education is alive and growing both as an operational and conceptual movement. Due to its rapid and continuing growth, however, a number of misconceptions have arisen, a phenomenon addressed in the next section.

Community Education - Some Common Misconceptions

Although many emerging movements are susceptible to misconceptions, community education is particularly vulnerable since it began as a field of practice without a sound philosophical or conceptual framework. In practice, community education, which began as an attempt to provide expanded usage of school facilities for public consumption, has evolved to a process of organizing and developing the entire community. This movement has not only historically evolved, but continues to maintain its flavor in many communities just beginning to implement the concept.

Stressing that variations are numerous, Decker (1975, 1976) offers us a building block sequence which progresses accordingly: expanded use of school facilities; learning and enrichment programs for all ages, interagency

coordination, and collaboration; citizen involvement and participation; community involvement in K-12 curriculum; and community organization and development.

Since communities may be in different stages of operationalization, misconceptions and narrow definitions occur. Most often, such misunderstandings result from perceiving a portion of the concept and mistaking it for the whole thing. Such misconceptions seem, on the whole, to fall into two areas: (a) Confusion of community education with its programs (b) Confusion with its vehicle or delivery system/coordinating mechanism.

Community Education Viewed as a Series of Progams

The reader will recall the admonition voiced by a number of authors that community education is primarily a process and, as such, should not be confused with its programs, which are activities related to the solution of particular community needs. Apparently the confusion of community education process with its programs is the most common misconception in the movement (Clark, 1977; Harris, 1976; Kerensky, 1972; LeTarte and Minzey, 1972; and Olson and Clark, 1977). Related, is the misbelief that community education consists primarily of programs to serve the poor and disadvantaged (Clark, 1977; Harris, 1976; LeTarte and Minzey, 1972; and Olson and Clark, 1977).

Community Education and Community School Equated

In many communities where public schools have embraced the community education concept residents, apparently, view the "neighborhood" or "community" school as synonymous

with community education (Clark, 1977; LeTarte and Minzey, 1972; Olson and Clark, 1977). Residents are not alone in their outlook, however, since many public officials, professionals from other areas, as well as some proponents and community educators themselves perpetuate this misconception. Of course, this stance is due, in large part, to the fact the movement was initially conceived as a means of deriving maximum utilization of school facilities. Community schools, however, are not synonymous with the community education concept in totality, an issue which seems to be a major hurdle to overcome for the further growth of the movement.

Summary

The search for a "sense of community" has received renewed attention in recent times. Community education, a developing concept and movement has contributed much momentum to this quest. Underlying the community education concept is the belief that education is an on-going lifelong process, which is not synonymous with schooling, but is an interdependent responsiblity of the home, school and community.

Community education initially developed as a field of practice during the 1930's when Frank Manley, a Flint, Michigan physical education teacher induced C.S. Mott, a wealthy industrialist, to provide funds for keeping school buidings open weekends and evenings, and for staffing

them. Although originally charged with providing only activities for youth, the role of such personnel expanded to one of identifying and providing for all the needs of all community members, using the school as the coordinating mechanism. Identification of community needs was developed through the establishment of vehicles for citizen input generally known as community advisory councils - which have since become a central feature of the concept.

Although community education efforts have grown steadily since Manley's initial attempts, the last ten years have witnessed significant advances. Social conditions which have stimulated the renewed interest in a "sense of community" and spurred the advances of the community education movement include general societal conditions such as unemployment; crime and inflation; increased feelings of alienation; environmental concerns; youth unrest; and others.

The community education concept has evolved from an orientation of providing programs to one of creating a process of citizen involvement in decisions affecting the community. In a comprehensive work on this key element of process Warden (1979) identified four different process perspectives: process as procedure, problem-solving, community power, and psychological/social development, the latter of which is the most frequently used rendition in community education.

The ultimate goal of community education is the development of self-guiding, self-directed communities, which are able to identify and satisfy the total needs of all community members. Toward this end, efforts rally around five components: (a) Enrichment of K-12 progams (b) Maximum utilization of available resources (c) Provision of programs and services for all age groups (d) Community involvement (e) Interagency cooperation, coordination, and collaboration.

In order to address these components successfully, three factors must be present: (a) A delivery system or coordinating mechanism (b) An individual responsible for coordinating the process (c) A strategy or process for citizen input. Traditionally, community education efforts have concentrated on the public schools as the coordinating mechanism, although community educators are currently being challenged to develop nonschool-based models as well. Other institutional models which have resulted to date include community colleges, libraries, and others.

Although great strides have been made in the evolution of the community education movement, several misconceptions have provided obstacles for further advancement. Cited as barriers are the erroneous assumptions that community education is: (a) merely a series of loosely related programs and (b) synonymous with the community school.

CHAPTER 3

LIFELONG LEARNING AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION: AN INTERFACE

The lifelong learning and community education concepts are, unfortunately, often misconceived and narrowly defined both by proponents as well as by the public-at-large. Perhaps the most overwhelming reason for this dilemma is understanding of and/or exposure to only a part of the concept and mistaking it for the whole; a situation, of course, which often leads to operational narrowness.

The old adage rings true - We can't see the forest from the trees.... unless we mount an aerial view of the territory. The first two chapters have attempted to offer such a bird's eye view of the two concepts, and the movements of which they are an integral part, in order to provide a solid foundation for an interface. In addition to understanding each concept in totality, it is important to realize that both are part of a much greater thrust occurring in society-at-large.

Part of a Larger Thrust

The lifelong learning and community education movement are only manifestations of much more fundamental change occurring in society-at-large. Both are part of what may become one of the great transformations in history, one which futurists term

a transition from an Industrial to a Trans-industrial Society. In such a society learning would be a prime concern of all phases of life and of all social institutions (Harman, 1976).

According to futurist Willis Harman, Associate Director of Stanford University's Center for the study of Social Policy, the following signposts are already visible (Harman, 1978):

1. Growing insistence on self-determination
2. Increased emphasis on quality of life
3. Movement toward "appropriate technology": (non-pollution, resource conservation, etc.)
4. Emergence of decentralization practices
5. Acceptance of ecological ethic
6. Search for transcendental meanings

These are not the ideals of a romantic visionary, but a visionary scholar who is likewise aware of societal conditions and potentially powerful resistance of institutional forces. Times ahead may be full of despair and frustration as we try to create a new social order, says Harman who cautions us with this warning:

> "If we fail to understand that modern industrial society is indeed pregnant with the new order and mistake the creative forces for threats to our well-being, we could respond defensively and end up with the birth process being far more disruptive than need be - and perhaps with even a miscarriage" (Harman, 1978).

Such is the challenge which faces both movements, individually and collectively. Therefore, an interface of lifelong learning and community education, two complementary endeavors, --initially at conceptual level -- should provide a far greater impact for society. Both

community education and lifelong learning have visions, goals, substance, and momentum, much of which overlap. The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to take an initial step in making that overlap more visible and to highlight any apparent differences.

Toward this end a starter list of similarities and differences between two concepts is presented. Where pertinent, the presentation is accompanied by the inclusion of "challenge questions", designed to help generate and direct our initial research efforts. This list is neither exhaustive nor comprehensive in scope. Rather, it is offered as a means of stimulating dialogue and precipitating research thought in this area. The reader is encouraged throughout to modify, elaborate upon, and especially to generate his/her own comparative analyses and "challenge questions."

Similarities/Differences/and Challenge Questions

At the philosophical level, both lifelong learning and community education appear to share a common foundation.

Similarities:

- Issues of BOTH movements have been heralded as major philosophical concern down through the ages.
- Evolution of BOTH movements emerging with time-appropriateness in response to a variety of social conditions.
- BOTH are sociopsychological in intent.
- BOTH operate on similar images of the powerful potential of the individual and society to achieve higher levels of being.
- BOTH represent serious rethinking of the education process.

- BOTH share belief in the necessity to foster self-directedness.

- BOTH have visions of educative environments (educative community and learning society respectively) in which all environmental resources will dedicate some part of their energies to education.

CHALLENGE QUESTION: WHAT EFFORTS CAN AND/OR SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN TO CREATE AN AWARENESS AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE COMMON VISION AND PHILOSOPHY WHICH THE TWO MOVEMENTS SHARE?

****

At the conceptual and operational levels a number of differences as well as similarities surface.

Similarity:

- BOTH concepts, in theory and practice, are often misconceived and narrowly defined. Many supporters, as well as the public, do not perceive the larger whole of which they are a part.

CHALLENGE QUESTIONS: WHAT FACTORS INHIBIT AND/OR FACILITATE COMPREHENSIVE UNDERSTANDING OF: (1) COMMUNITY EDUCATION (2) LIFELONG LEARNING?

WHAT CAN BE DONE TO FURTHER FACILITATE A COMPREHENSIVE UNDERSTANDING?

WHAT ARE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT UNDERSTANDING THE CONCEPTS IN TOTALITY?

****

Similarities:

- BOTH are concerned with making learning opportunities available to individuals of all ages (preschool, youth, adolesents, adults, older adults).

- BOTH are flexible in their definitions of learning opportunities.

- BOTH stress the cruciality of reaching all groups of learners, including the underserved such as minorities, disadvantaged, handicapped, women, etc.

Differences: - Community education places additional emphasis on meeting non educational type needs (e.g. social services, health services, transportation, etc.) which, incidentally, often act as barriers to full participation in learning opportunities.

CHALLENGE QUESTION: WHAT CAN COMMUNITY EDUCATORS DO TO ANALYZE THE RELATIONSHIP OF PROVIDING NONEDUCATIONAL SERVICE TO IMPROVING PARTICIPATION IN, ATTITUDE TOWARD AND ACCESS TO LEARNING.

****

Similarity: - BOTH incorporate all spheres of learning: physical, intellectual, emotional, social, spiritual.

Differences: - Community education does not appear to articulate on the integration among the spheres, an area which lifelong education emphasizes.

CHALLENGE QUESTION: SHOULD COMMUNITY EDUCATION ADDRESS INTEGRATION AMONG LEARNING SPHERES AND, IF SO, HOW?

****

Similarities: - BOTH recognize the existence of many agents of learning within a community: formal (schools, colleges, universities, etc.); nonformal (work, places, libraries, museums, religious institutions, etc.); and informal (family, friends, peers, individual professionals)

- BOTH acknowledge the crucial role of the home as an educative agent in the process of learning.

- BOTH acknowledge the role of work places as well as cultural, recreational, religious, social, health agents, the mass media, and others in the process of learning.

- BOTH recognize that peers, friends, and professionals of the community are important learning resources.

- BOTH stress the necessity of integrating these efforts in order to produce an educative community and/or learning society.

Differences: - Community education focuses upon the different levels of integration which might ensue; namely:

Coordination - Working together harmoniously
Cooperation - Working toward a common goal or purpose, usually associated with mutual benefit
Collaboration - Working together in a joint effort.

CHALLENGE QUESTIONS: HOW CAN EACH OF THE THREE LEVELS OF INTERACTION BE FOSTERED?

WHAT PREREQUISITES SEEM IMPORTANT AT EACH LEVEL?

WHEN IS EACH LEVEL NECESSARY? DESIRED?

****

Similarities: - BOTH are vitally concerned with the reorganization of the formal education system, particularly at the K-12 level, to a more "life centered" curriculum, which includes the entire community. This tenet implies a two-way process by which learning is enriched. (1) Community resouces entering the school (2) Learning experiences penetrating into the larger community as part of the curriculum.

Differences: - Curriculum - UNESCO's (representing lifelong education) efforts in this direction, noted on page 10, use curriculum in the broad sense to include development of goals and objectives; teacher training; material development and evaluation; as well as planning, implementation, and evaluation of the program/curriculum. At present, the community education concept seems to address curriculum at the program implementation level.

CHALLENGE QUESTIONS: HOW CAN COMMUNITY EDUCATION EFFORTS ADDRESS THE NOTION OF CURRICULUM CHANGE AND REORGANIZATION IN ITS BROADEST SENSE?

HOW CAN COMMUNITY EDUCATION EFFORTS APPLY UNESCO FINDINGS ON LIFELONG EDUCATION AND SCHOOL CURRICULUM?

****

Difference: - Implementation - The focus of implementation is different. Lifelong education heavily stresses the development of "inquiry skills" and self-directedness as an indispensable feature in developing a lifelong learner, a crucial goal of the movement. Community education is beginning to stress the need to center curriculum around "life concerns" thus nurturing the birth of an individual who views learning as an integral part of living. The notion of developing self-directed learners, however, does not seem to receive much attention at present within the community education concept.

CHALLENGE QUESTION: WHAT EFFORTS ARE NECESSARY TO IMPACT ON THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A CURRICULUM WHICH IS BOTH LIFE-CENTERED AND FOSTERS SELF-DIRECTION?

****

Similarity: - BOTH are concerned with involving individuals in a planning process of needs assessment, problem identification and evaluation of strategies, implementation of plan, and overall evalution.

Differences: - Community education focuses efforts on helping individuals work together, and stresses the whole process of community involvement in problem solving as a vital learning opportunity and as a way of making communities self-governing (self-directed communities).

- Lifelong education emphasizes the cruciality of developing self-directed learners and the necessity of supporting individuals in their "learning project" guests (planning, directing and evaluating one's own learning experience, seeking guidance when and where needed).

CHALLENGE QUESTIONS: WHAT ROLE SHOULD COMMUNITY EDUCATION PLAY IN DEVELOPING STRATEGIES TO LINK LEARNERS WITH LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES?

WHAT RELATIONSHIP SHOULD COMMUNITY EDUCATION HAVE WITH EXISTING BROKERING SERVICES?

IN GENERAL, WHAT ROLE CAN AND/OR SHOULD COMMUNITY EDUCATION PLAY IN FOSTERING THE GROWTH OF SELF-DIRECTED LEARNERS AT ALL AGES AND STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT?

****

Similarity: - BOTH have federal policy, more states, and local communities have community education policy.

CHALLENGE QUESTIONS: WHAT KIND OF STRATEGY CAN BE DEVELOPED TO EDUCATE LOCAL POLICYMAKERS, POLITICAL LEADERS, MASS MEDIA, RELIGIOUS GROUPS, TRADE UNIONS, ETC. AS TO BOTH CONCEPTS IN TOTALITY AS WELL AS INTERACTION BETWEEN THEM AND TO GENERATE SUPPORT?

HOW CAN COOPERATION BE ENCOURAGED AMONG LOCAL POLICYMAKING GROUPS (e.g. SCHOOL BOARDS, COUNTY AND CITY GOVERNING BOARDS, AGENCY POLICY MAKING BOARDS, ETC.)

HOW CAN LEARNING AGENTS AND THE REPRESENTATIVES OF LEARNING GROUPS BE ORGANIZED TO ACT IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY TO POLICYMAKING GROUPS?

****

....and perhaps the most important differences

Differences: - Unlike lifelong education, community education has a cadre of professionals who identify themselves as community educators, and professional associations at both national and state levels.

CHALLENGE QUESTIONS: USING SUCH A NETWORK, HOW MIGHT A SYSTEM BE DEVELOPED FOR IDENTIFYING WHAT RESEARCH HAS BEEN DONE AND WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE RELEVANT TO LIFELONG LEARNING AT THE LOCAL LEVEL (COMMUNITY CONTEXT), NOT ONLY BY COMMUNITY EDUCATORS, BUT ALSO BY THOSE IN OTHER DISCIPLINES WHOSE WORK IMPINGES ON THIS AREA (e.g. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS, SOCIOLOGISTS, ECOLOGISTS, ETC.)

WHAT ARE THE OTHER DISCIPLINES AND WHO ARE THE OTHER PROFESSIONALS WHO MIGHT CONTRIBUTE THE MOST TO RESEARCH ON LIFELONG LEARNING IN THE COMMUNITY CONTEXT?

HOW CAN THESE INDIVIDUALS BE DRAWN INTO THE RESEARCH QUEST (ON LIFELONG LEARNING AT THE COMMUNITY LEVEL)?

****

Differences: - Lifelong learning movement views the entire society as the delivery system for providing services to the lifelong learner.

- Community education advocates the use of a coordinating mechanism generally the public school, to ensure that efforts are integrated and focused on achieving goals and philosophy.

CHALLENGE QUESTIONS: IS THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL AS A COORDINATING MECHANISM HELPING TO FOSTER LIFELONG LEARNING TENETS? SPECIFICALLY, IS IT HELPING TO DISPEL THE NOTION THAT SCHOOLING IS SYNONYMOUS WITH EDUCATION? IS IT TRANSFORMING THE ROLE OF SCHOOL INTO ONLY ONE EDUCATIVE AGENT IN THE COMMUNITY?

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS AND/OR DANGERS INHERENT IN ADVOCATING THE SUPREMACY OF THE SCHOOL AS THE MAIN VEHICLE FOR OPERATIONALIZING THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION CONCEPT?

DEPENDING UPON COMMUNITY SIZE, NATURE, ETC. IS THE SCHOOL ALWAYS THE MOST EFFECTIVE COORDINATING MECHANISM? WHAT OTHER WAYS CAN THE IDEA OF A COORDINATING MECHANISM BE OPERATIONALIZED IN EITHER AN INSTITUTIONALIZED OR NON INSTITUTIONALIZED MANNER?

****

More Global Challenge Questions

These challenge questions should help guide our thinking; however, in analyzing the interface between lifelong learning and community education a number of more global issues must also be addressed. Since we are dealing with two emerging movements, the following questions are pertinent:

1. What benefits can be derived from an interface of the two movements?
2. How can the two movements interface?
3. What problems and obstacles must be overcome to effectuate such an interface?
4. How might the community education movement serve to actualize lifelong learning?
5. How might the lifelong learning movement serve to nourish a "sense of community?"

6. How can community educators hook up forces with professionals of other movements whose synergistic input is essential in actualizing the educative community and learning society (e.g. adult education movement, human resource development, humanistic and transpersonal, psychology movements, and others)?

7. What joint steps can be taken, first of all, to educate the public?

In fact a comparative analysis of this nature causes one to wonder if we may be dealing with two movements which represent a difference of degree, rather than kind. Both movements seem to be aimed at society and individual self-renewal and growth (so basically no difference in kind). Lifelong learning, however, is aimed at a global level and tends, at present, to be more of a conceptual and ideological movement dependent upon a number of other movements and forces; while community education is aimed at the local level (difference in degree) and, in effect, is operational in nature-- potentially ready and able to joint hands together with other operational movements in order to actualize the lifelong learning ideology.

As a result of the emergence and potential interaction between these two movements, as well as others (adult education movement, human resource development movement, human potential movement, transpersonal psychology movement, etc.) a potential societal transformation is predicted. In this regard a number of critical issue questions arise:

1. How have educational systems and other social elements accepted or rejected societal transformation of the past? (e.g. Copernican Revolution)

2. What steps need to be taken to ensure a healthy and firmly rooted transition?

Summary

According to futurists, society seems on the verge of a major transformation from an industrial to a transindustrial society, which would be characterized by -- among other things -- the primacy afforded to learning by all societal institutions and for all phases of life.

Lifelong learning and community education are two complementary movements which are reflective of this more fundamental change occuring in society-at-large. As isolated thrusts, each has only a fraction of the potential possible if both were to collectively impact society. In attempting an interface -- initially at a conceptual level -- a number of global "challenge questions" surface. At the most far reaching level an ultimate societal transformation necessitates that at least thought be given to questions such as:

- What steps are needed to ensure a healthy and firmly rooted transition?
- How have educational systems and other social elements accepted or rejected societal transformation of the past?

recognizing, of course, that ultimate interaction among a number of other movements (e.g. adult education, human resource development, human potential, humanistic and transpersonal psychology, etc.) will be essential.

On a more immediate level a potential interface between lifelong learning and community education requires

an inspection of how the two movements might interface, what benefits might be derived, and what problems must be overcome. In addition to these more global issues of interfacing two movements and ultimately catalyzing a societal transformation, specific stepping stones to that goal are provided by penetratingly exploring both concepts as they converge, diverge, and ultimately interface. The crux of the chapter, therefore, pinpointed a number of similarities and differences between lifelong learning and community education from which a series of challenge questions, summarized below, were derived.

Challenge Questions:

- What efforts can or should be undertaken to create an awareness of the common vision and philosophy which the two movements share?
- Relevant to fostering a comprehensive understanding of the two concepts of (a) community education (b) lifelong learning: What factors inhibit a comprehensive understanding? What factors facilitate a comprehensive understanding? What can be done to further facilitate a comprehensive understanding? What are the consequences of not understanding the concepts in totality?
- What can community educators do to analyze the relationship of providing noneducational services such as health, social services, transportation, etc. (purported barriers to full participation in learning opportunities) to improved, participation in, attitude toward, and access to learning?
- Should community education address integration among the learning spheres (physical, intellectual, emotional, social, spiritual) and, if so, how?
- Relevant to the three levels of potential interagency interaction (coordination, cooperation, and collaboration): How can each of the three levels of interaction be fostered? What prerequisite seems

important at each level? When is each level necessary? desired?

- Relevant to reorganization of the K-12 curriculum in the light of lifelong education: How can community education efforts address the notion of curriculum change and reorganization in its broadest sense (including development of goals and objectives, materials development and evaluation, teacher training, as well as planning, implementation and evaluation of the program/curriculum)? How can community education efforts apply UNESCO findings on lifelong education and school curriculum? What efforts are necessary to impact on the development and implementation of a curriculum which is both "life-centered" and fosters self-directedness?

- Relevant to linking learners with learning opportunities: What role should community education play in developing strategies to accomplish this? What relationship should community education have with existing brokering services? In general what role can and/or should community education play in fostering the growth of self-directed learners at all ages and stages of development?

- Relevant to policymaking on the local level: What kind of strategy can be developed to educate local policymakers, political leaders, mass media, religious groups, trade unions, etc. as to both concepts in totality, as well as the interaction between them, and generate support? How can cooperation be encouraged among local policymaking groups (e.g. school boards, county and city governing boards, agency policy making boards , etc.)? How can learning agents and the representatives of learning groups be organized to act in an advisory capacity to policymaking groups?

- How might use be made of the professional network which community educators have organized to develop a system for identifying what research has been done and what needs to be done relevant to lifelong learning at the local level (community context), not only by community educators, but also by those in other disciplines whose work inpinges on this area (e.g. community development speicalists, sociologists, ecologists, etc.)

- Relevant to others who might contribute the most to research on lifelong learning at the community level: What are the other disciplines and who are the other professionals? How can these individuals be drawn into the research quest?

- Relevant to the community school, the most commonly advocated delivery system for the community education concept: Is the community school as a coordinating mechanism helping to foster lifelong learning tenets? Specifically, is it helping to dispel the notion that schooling is synonymous with education? Is it transforming the role fo the school into only one educative agent in the community? What are the benefits and/or dangers inherent in advocating the supremacy of the school as the main vehicle for operationalizing the community education concept? Depending upon community size, nature, etc. is the school always the most effective coordinating mechanism? What other ways can the idea of a coordinating mechanism be operationalized in either an institutionalized or noninstitutionalized manner?

Of course, a prioritization of these issue areas is an essential next step to be undertaken by a dual effort of researchers and practitioners. A question still remains, however, as to what other research efforts have been undertaken to interface the two concepts and, more important, how we can begin to organize these efforts to encourage and stimulate more dialogue and research in this area, - all focal points of the final chapter.

CHAPTER 4

TOWARD A RESEARCH AGENDA

Previous Efforts to Interface the Two Concepts

Previous efforts to integrate the two concepts of community education and lifelong learning have been difficult to uncover. The community education literature is replete with references to lifelong learning. Likewise, the literature on lifelong learning teems with references to the local community as an important aspect of lifelong learning endeavors.

Only a few efforts, however, have attempted to investigate the potential areas of needed research. Two (and there may be more) major efforts were unearthed, although both deal only with the adult years. First, the National Community Education Advisory Council (USOE, HEW) commissioned the Council of Adult Education Organizations (CAEO) to conduct a project which explored the relationships between lifelong learning and community education (CAEO, 1977).

Essentially, a panel of eleven experts from the fields of community education and adult education were selected, seven of whom participated in providing answers to a number of key questions such as: What factors favor and what factors inhibit close relationships between lifelong learning and community education; What are the similarities in philosophy

and what are the differences between lifelong learning and community education, and others.

Answers were reported in verbatim individual format and no synthesis of results was offered; therefore, the interested reader may want to refer to the final report to witness the variability of responses and/or to draw conclusions from the data presented. Perhaps the most apparent result was the lack of consensus evidenced in the conceptual understanding of the movements. Although a few individuals did demonstrate a wholistic grasp of one or both concepts, these cases were certainly atypical.

In a more research-oriented effort Hiemstra (1978) identified six research priority areas for use in investigating the role of the community as a setting for lifelong learning. Although his efforts focused on the adult years, many of his questions, listed below, can equally apply to all age groups.

1. How can we activate the educative community? (Identifying needs and resources, matching learners and resources, training educators, etc.)

   How can parents learn to better use the community in the education of their children?

   How can citizens better serve as resource persons for policy making, program planning, and other areas?

   What role changes will be necessary for educators and their training?

2. How can we effect a better understanding of the relationship each individual has with his/her community? (Effect of individual variables (e.g. age, health, finances, mobility, etc.) and community variables (e.g. small versus large urban versus rural, etc.) with respect to lifelong learning needs and participation?

3. How extensive and varied are self-planned "learning projects" in the community?

   What are public policy issues that relate to self-initiated learning in community?

   How should lifelong learning professionals facilitate and/or relate to such activitiy?

   What learning resources need to be developed by tax-supported educational institutions?

   What difference in self-planned learning exists in relation to variables such as: size and type of community, geographical location, extent of higher education opportunities?

4. What is the effect of community change and growth on lifelong learning opportunities and activities.

5. What are the learning needs of special groups such as older learner, women, disadvantaged, minorities, the worker, etc. What is the usefulness and current availability of community resources for them. What is their relation to traditional programming?

6. In an effort to link the various agents of learning within a community what is happening and what can be done in the areas of interagency interface relevant to needs, duplication of programs, competition for students, and effective utilization of scarce resources?

Despite their purported adult orientation, Hiemstra's questions represent a good start as do, hopefully, the challenge questions posited by the present inquiry. By integrating these two sets of questions, a number of reoccuring themes emerge such as: fostering effective agency interation; linking learners and learning opportunities; policy making issues on the local level; fostering the growth of, and providing support for self-directed

learners and other themes. Although we must begin to address these critical issues immediately, it is likewise essential to organize a more coherent framework (based on the essential components and characteristics of life-long learning and community education) from which other such questions can be generated.

This chapter provides a first step in that direction. Based on a comprehensive view of the two movements and concepts, presented in the first two chapters, a proposed framework was developed with guidance afforded from a previously established framework on lifelong learning during adulthood developed by the Future Direction for a Learning Society Project (Advisory Panel, 1978). Zeroing in on a portion of the framework (i.e. community setting) the present undertaking expanded upon that area by both extending age groupings and by further developing all categories.[1]

The reader is urged to visually refer to the presently proposed framework on page 65 for clarification throughout the discussion which ensues. First of all, lifelong learning takes place in many societal contexts, one of which is the local community, the focus of community education efforts - thus the title Organizing Research on Lifelong Learning ... within the context of the local community Since lifelong learning and community education

---

[1]Special thanks to Roger Hiemstra for supplying materials which triggered the idea of adapting the FDLS agenda for present purposes.

TABLE 2

PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR ORGANIZING RESEARCH ON LIFELONG LEARNING FOR PRESCHOOL, YOUTH, ADOLESCENT, ADULTS, AND OLDER ADULTS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY[a]

COMPONENTS/ELEMENTS OF LEARNING PROCESS	LEARNING AGENTS Formal ⟷ Nonformal ⟷ Informal
	(As applied to Individuals, Groups, including those with special needs and community levels)
	Interaction Among Agents (Cooperation, coordination, collaboration)
Interaction Among Elements ↑	
Purposes	
Needs	
Goals and Objectives	
Motivation	
Learning Spheres (physical, intellectual, emotional, social, and spiritual)	
Learning Formats	
Leader directed ⟷ self-directed	
Learning Context	
Domains: Cognitive, Affective, Pyscho-motor	
Areas: Individual Development	
Occupational/Vocational (worker)	
Family & Parenting (family member)	
Civic & Social (citizen)	
Self-enrichment	
Preparation for self-directed learning	
Community Development	
Environmental	
Political	
Technological	
Others	
Relationships of individual to community	
Learning Resources (other then agents)	
Facilities	
Staff	
Material (hardward/software)	
Finances	
Other Community resources and services	
Support Functions	
Preparation of learning facilitators (Pre service & in-service)	
Counseling	
Administration	
Citizen Input[b]	
Policymaking	
Program Planning and Evaluation	
Research	
Coordinating Mechanism	
Outcomes	
Individual	
Groups	
Community	

Research questions asked within two areas:

1. Philosophical/ Conceptual
2. Operational

and from two modes:

1. Present (What is now)
2. Future (What might or could be)

a. Development of separate matrices for each of the age groups is recommended, although potential involvement among them is acknowledged and encouraged.

b. Citizen input, particularly at the adult level, becomes a learning process in itself and may have to be repositioned within framework.

target all age groups, development of individual matrices for each of the following age groups is recommended: preschool, youth, adolescent, adult, older adult; keeping mindful, of course, of potential interactional research questions among them. Interactional research is a key concept which is difficult to visually depict on a framework. As a result one might want to keep in mind that interactional relationships among variables on either axis are possible to pose within this framework. Now, for an inspection of the essence of the framework: First, the belief that many agents of learning co-exist within a community is shared by both movements - thus the horizontal axis which classifies agents as: formal (schools, colleges, etc.) nonformal (nonschool organizations, institutions, associations, groups, etc.) and informal (family, peer, colleagues, friends, professional members of the community, etc.). Since interaction and potential linkages among these agents are a critical thrust of both movements, research questions may be embraced in terms of the three levels of interaction provided by community educators -- coordination, cooperation, and collaboration, as well as in terms of how each agent individually as well as collectively relates, to components or elements of the Learning Process listed on the vertical axis. Of course, interactional research is similarly possible among the different elements of learning in terms of how they might affect one another.

In addition to the research questions generated from an interaction of variables on either the horizontal or vertical axis, questions will likewise result from an interface of one or more variable of the horizontal axis with one or more variables on the vertical axis. For example, the following Challenge Question: "How Can Cooperation be Encouraged Among Local Policymaking Groups" represents this type of interface. Policymaking, a support function on the vertical axis interfaces with the "group" or type of learning agent on the horizontal axis (e.g. formal and/or nonformal) at the "cooperation" level of interaction.

Another way in which the framework may prove useful is to superimpose questions on the entire matrix. Hiemstra's research question "How Can We Activate the Educative Community" provides such an example. Clearly, in order to completely actualize the educative community we must attend to all research questions generated from the matrix. In order to activate it, however, we may wish to zero in on the relationship among the various learning agents (horizontal axis) in terms of individual and community needs (vertical axis) or with a host of other variables. The matrix should help one, when asking such a broad question, to identify which components of elements should be addressed and in what order of priority, thus lending both comprehensiveness and specificity to research endeavors.

Finally, it is recommended that development of a research agenda include research questions within two areas:

(a) Philosophical/conceptual (b) Operational. Furthermore, two modes of questioning are suggested: (a) Present -- What exists now (b) Future -- What might or should exist in the future. Pursuit of both types of questioning will eventually enable one to determine needs -- that is, between what exists now and what is hoped for.

Conclusion

The present effort has made no attempt to specifically pinpoint or prioritize areas of needed research. That task can only be accomplished after careful inspection of problem areas and appropriate derivation of research questions, an imperative task for future researchers.

Building a solid foundation, however, is essential. Use of a framework to organize such efforts, as a result, should help. State of the art reviews in each of the framework areas is encouraged, as is philosophical inquiry and conceptual analyses.

Building a strong theoretical base will be crucial. Exploratory and future studies will be of heuristic value in generating potentially critical areas of investigation as will historical inquiry, thus paving the way for descriptive research, action research, etc. and onward (finally) to the more experimental and quasi-experimental approaches of verification when a solid foundation is already established.

Use of a framework should help in organizing research which has already been done, thus revealing the nature and extent of such a foundation in different areas, as well as regions in need of further inquiry. The currently proposed framework is only a start. Many may want to dismember and realign it; others may wish to elaborate upon or reorganize it; while some may be motivated to construct a differently devised structural frame. All of us, however, must somehow work together in building a structure to guide our inquiry into the united realm of community education and lifelong learning. A responsibility and a challenge lies ahead. We must "go where there is no path and leave a trail". Hopefully, this modest attempt has fashioned some footwook toward that end.

REFERENCES

Advisory Panel on Research Needs in Lifelong Learning During Adulthood. Lifelong learning during adulthood: An agenda for research. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978.

Boles, H.W. & Seay, M.F. Institutions, communities, and the agencies of community education. In M.F. Seay (Ed.) Community education: A developing concept. Midland, Michigan: Pendell, 1974.

Broschart, J.R. Lifelong learning in the nation's third century. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Clark, P.A. Community education and its major components. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28(4), 5-8.

Coalition of Adult Education Organizations (CAEO). Relationships between community education and lifelong learning. Final Report for Community Education Advisory Council, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, HEW, 1977.

Cox, J.C. Community education and community schools. In E. Fairchild & L. Neal (Eds.), Common-Unity in the Community. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 1975.

Cropley, A.J. Lifelong education: A psychological analysis. New York: Pergamon Press, 1977.

Cropley, A. J. & Dave, R. H. (Eds.) Lifelong education and the training of teachers. New York: Pergamon Press, 1978.

Dave, R. H. Lifelong education and school curriculum. (Monograph 1). Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education, 1973.

Dave, R. H. (Ed.). Reflections on lifelong education and the school (Monograph 3). Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education, 1975.

Dave, R. H. (Ed.). Foundations of lifelong learning. New York: Pergamon Press, 1976.

Dave, R. H. & Stiemerling, H. (Eds.). Lifelong education and the schools: Abstracts and bibliography (Monograph 2). Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education, 1973.

Decker, L.E. Community education; the need for a conceptual framework. NASSP (National Association of Secondary School Principals) Bulletin, 1975, 59(394), 5-15.

Faure, E. et.al. Learning to be: The world of education today and tomorrow. Paris: UNESCO, 1972.

Future directions for a learning society. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978.

Gibb, J.R. Trust: A new view of personal and organizational development. Los Angeles: Guild of Tutors Press, 1978.

Gross, R. The lifelong learner. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1977.

Harman, W. An incomplete guide to the future. San Francisco; San Francisco Book Company, 1976.

Harman, W. Education for a transforming society. Association for Humanistic Psychology Newsletter, July, 1978.

Harris, O. The need for community education. Journal of Thought, 1976, 11(1), 58-59.

Hiemstra, R. The community perspective for research on lifelong learning.

Hiemstra, R. The educative community: Linking the community, school, and family. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, 1972.

Hiemstra, R. Lifelong learning. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publication, 1976.

Jackson, M.L. Moving toward self-directed learning. Childhood Education, 1973, 50(1), 26-28.

Kaplan, M. (Ed.). Public schools: Use them don't waste them. Charlottesville: Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, University of Virginia, 1975.

Kerensky, V. M. Correcting some misconceptions about community education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1972, 54(3), 158-160.

Kidd, J.R. The inner-continuum: Some notes on the application of a third dimension to reflections and research about lifelong education. In R. H. Dave (Ed.), Reflections on lifelong education and the school (Monograph 3). Hamburg, UNESCO Institute for Education, 1975.

Kidd, J.R. Relentless verity: Education for being, becoming, belonging. Address delivered upon receipt of William Pearson Tolley Medal for Distinquished Leadership in Adult Education, 1973 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 094 158).

Knowles, M.S. Self-directed learning: A guide for teachers and learners, New York: Association Press, 1975.

LeTarte, C.E. & Minzey, J.D. Community education: From program to process. Midland, Michigan: Pendell, 1972.

Lynch, J. Lifelong education and the preparation of educational personnel. (Monograph 5). Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education, 1977.

Martin, G.C. & Seay, M. F. Organizational and administrative structure for comments education. In M.F. Seay (Ed.), Community education: A developing concept. Midland, Michigan: Pendell, 1974.

Mondale, W. F. The next step: Lifelong learning. Change, October, 1976, 42-45.

The National Institute for the Management of Lifelong Education. Cambridge: Harvard College, 1979.

Ohliger, J. Is lifelong adult education a guarantee of permanent inadequacy? Convergence, 7, 1974, 47-58.

Ohliger, J. Prospects for a learning society, Adult Leadership, 24(1), 1975, 37-39.

Olsen, E. G. Standing on the shoulders of pioneers. Community Education Journal, 1975, 5(6), 8-12, 47.

Olsen, E. G. & Clark, P.A. Life-centering education. Midland, Michigan: Pendell, 1977.

Parsons, S.R. Emerging models of community education. Midland, Michigan: Pendell, 1976.

Peterson, R.E. et.al. Lifelong learning in America: An overview of current practices, available resources and future prospects. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives. Hearing on bill to promote development and expansion of community schools throughout the United Stated. H.R. 772, H.R. 6697, and H.R. 10049, 93rd Congress, 1st session, September 6, 1973, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Seay, M.F. Some principles of an educational program. In M.F. Seay (Ed.). Adult education: A part of a total educational program. Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service, 10(4), Lexington, Ky.: Jalvern of Kentucky, 1938.

Seay, M.F. (Ed.). Community education: A developing concept. Midland, Michigan: Pendell, 1974.

Skager, R. Lifelong education and evaluation practice. New York: Pergamon Press, 1978.

Skager, R. & Dave, R.H. Curriculum evaluation for lifelong education. New York: Pergamon Press, 1977.

Spaulding, S. A modest model for planning and research. Comparative Education, 10(2), 1974, 101-113.

State planning for lifelong learning: Improving access for all citizens. A report of a National Invitational Conference, Orlando, Florida, February, 1977. Tallahasse: State of Florida Department of Education, 1977.

Totten, W.F. Beliefs about community education. In J. Warden (Ed.) Toward community: A community education sourcebook. Charlottesville, VA: Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, 1977.

Warden, J.W. Process perspectives: Community education as process. Charlottesville, VA.: Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, University of Virginia, 1979.

Weaver, D.C. A case for theory development in community education. Phi Delta Kappan, 54(3), 1972, 154-157.

Whitt, R. L. A handbook for the community school director. Midland, Michigan: Pendell, 1971.

Wood, G.S. & Seay, M.F. Accountability and evaluation as a basis for decision-making. In M.F. Seay (Ed.). Community education: A developing concept. Midland, Michigan: Pendell, 1974.

Ziegler, W. The future of adult education and learning in the United States. Final Report, Syracuse: The Educational Policy Research Center, Syracuse Research Corporation, 1977.